REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-23, 26, 27 and 32-39 are pending in this application. Claims 7-17, 20 and 21 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Schufelberger. Claims 18, 19 and 36 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Stotz. Claims 18, 19 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gakhar. Claims 2, 6, 33, 34, 37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gakhar in view of Werheiser. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Morris. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gakhar in view of Morris. Claims 26 and 27 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gakhar in view of Wirth. Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gakhar. Claims 1 and 35 are allowed. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Independent claim 2 has been amended to add the limitations of objected-to claim 3, and to eliminate the limitations related to the handle. The added limitations from claim 3 place claim 2 and its dependent claims into condition for allowance. Note that dependent claims 7-17 were previously withdrawn from consideration but are ripe for examination upon the allowance of independent claim 2.

Independent claim 18 has been amended in accordance with the telephone conference discussions of 14 December 2004 documented above. Independent claim 18 was previously rejected under 35 USC 102 in view of Stotz and in view of Gakhar. Limitations have been added to the claim to clarify that the structure comprises a flat surface for sliding along a side of a fence of a cutting machine, and to clarify that the work piece-contacting surfaces are co-planar relative to the surface of the work piece. Claim 18 and its dependent claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance, including previously withdrawn claims 20 and 21.

Independent claim 22 has been amended in accordance with the telephone conference discussions of 14 December 2004 documented above. Independent claim 22 was previously rejected under 35 USC 102 in view of Schaufelberger. Limitations

have been added to the claim to clarify that the work piece-contacting surfaces are coplanar relative to the surface of the work piece, and to clarify that the handle is moveably fixable to position the handle directly above the cutting device as it passes through the tunnel. Claim 22 and its dependent claim 23 are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 26, 27, 32-34, 37 and 38 have been cancelled herein.

Reconsideration of the amended application in view of the above Remarks and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-23, 35, 36 and 39 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

David G. Maire, Reg. No. 34,865

Beusse Brownlee Wolter Mora & Maire, P.A. 390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2500

Orlando, FL 32801

Telephone: (407) 926-7704